UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/837,711	04/17/2001	Stephen G. Withers	UBC. P-005 - 2	1131

20350 7590 02/24/2004

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER	
SLOBODYANSKY, ELIZABETH	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1652	

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/837,711	WITHERS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Elizabeth Slobodyansky, PhD	1652	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 November 2003*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *40-50 and 55* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *40-50 and 55* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The amendment filed November 24, 2003 canceling claims 51-54 and 56-70 has been entered.

Claims 40-50 and 55 are pending.

Response to Amendment

The Declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 by Dr. Stephen Withers filed November 24, 2003 is insufficient to overcome the 112, 1st paragraph, enablement rejection of claims 40-50 and 55 as set forth in the last Office action because: the Declaration describes experiments carried out using as glycosyl donors: α-glucopyranosyl fluoride, α-glucopyranosyl formate and α-glucopyranosyl azide. The specification teaches as an examples of modified glycosyl donors in addition to glycosyl fluorides are "glycosyl chlorides, acetates, propionates, and pivaloates" (specification, page 12). The term "modified" can encompass various undefined changes in the molecular structure. The described experiments are concerned not with the examples listed in the specification but with different glycosyl donors not specifically listed in the specification (Declaration, page 1). The Declaration does not indicate at what time the described experiments have been done. Absent evidence to the contrary, said time is assumed to be after the filing date of the instant invention. The enablement requirements must be met at the time of the filing. Because the examples used in the experiments are not listed in the specification and the experiments presumable were carried out after the filing date of

the instant invention, the Declaration is insufficient to overcome the 112, 1st paragraph, enablement rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 40-50 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the use of retaining glycosidases wherein the catalytically active carboxylic acid that is nucleophile is mutated to form an oligosaccharide using a specific glycosyl fluoride as a donor and a specific acceptor, does not reasonably provide enablement for a method for synthesizing any oligosaccharide using any glycosidase and any donor and acceptor molecules. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required, are summarized in In re Wands 858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2nd 1400 (Fed. Cir, 1988). They include (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount of direction or guidance presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4)

the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7)considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required, are summarized the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims.

Factors pertinent to this discussion include predictability of the art, guidance in the specification, breadth of claims, and the amount of experimentation that would be necessary to use the invention.

Claims 40-50 and 55 are so broad as to encompass method of use of any glycosidase both retaining and inverting, in which any one of the two catalytic carboxylic amino acids is mutated, in a stereospecific reaction using any donor and acceptor. The scope of the claims is not commensurate with the enablement provided by the disclosure with regard to the extremely large number of glycosidases having different structures, functions and substrate specificities, and donors and acceptors broadly encompassed by the claims. The disclosure teaches the method of use of a retaining glucosidase mutant, AbgE358A, with α-glucosyl fluoride or α-galactosyl fluoride as a donor and arylglycosides as acceptors to form oligosaccharides (Tables 1-3). The Declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 by Dr. Withers filed June 3, 2002 teaches the use of a nucleophile mutant of another retaining glycosidase, LacZ β-galactosidase, with a-galactosyl fluoride as a donor and two acceptors to form oligosaccharides. Therefore, only α-glucosyl fluoride and α-galactosyl fluoride are used as a donor. The art published after the filing date of the instant application teaches a few examples of other retaining glycosidases mutated at a catalytically active carboxylic acid nucleophile with a

respective glycosyl fluoride as a donor. Thus, no donors other than a respective glycosyl fluoride and a limited number of acceptors are known to be used up to date. However, the claims encompass any donor-acceptor pair irrespectively of the original substrate specificity of a glycosidase. Therefore, based on the instant disclosure and the state of the art, it is unpredictable whether any glycosidase when mutated at any one of the two catalytically active carboxylic amino acids will catalyze coupling of any glycosyl donor and any glycoside acceptor having opposite stereochemical configurations by either inverting or retaining mechanism.

Thus, applicants have not provided sufficient guidance to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to use any mutant glycosidase with any donor and any acceptor other than a retaining glycosidase mutated at a nucleophile catalytically active carboxylic acid with a respective glycosyl fluoride and acceptor to form an oligosaccharide in a manner reasonably correlated with the scope of the claims. Without sufficient guidance, using any mutant glycosidase with any donor other than glycosyl fluoride and any acceptor is unpredictable and the experimentation left to those skilled in the art is unnecessarily, and improperly, extensive and undue.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 40-50 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 40 (claims 41-50 and 55 dependent thereon) has been amended to recite "modified glycosyl donor" (emphasis added). Said term is defined in the specification by non-limiting examples rendering the metes and bounds of the claims unascertainable (page 8, line 19; page 12, lines 3-11).

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington,* 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321© may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 40-50 and 55 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent No. 5,716,812. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are claiming common subject matter, as follows: a method of coupling a glycosyl donor and a glycoside acceptor having opposite stereochemical configurations using a mutant glycosidase.

Claims 40-50 and 55 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,284,494. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are claiming common subject matter, as follows: a method of coupling a glycosyl donor and a glycoside acceptor having opposite stereochemical configurations using the *Agrobacterium* β-glucosidase E358A mutant as defined in claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,284,494.

Applicant's consideration for filing a TD stated in Responses filed June 3, 2002, March 4, 2003 and the current Remarks (page 11) is noted. The rejections are maintained until TD is filed.

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments filed on November 24, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With regard to the 112, 1st paragraph, rejection, Applicants argue that "the specification as filed broadly teaches the mutation of glycosidases at one of two catalytically active amino acids in the active site of the enzyme results in an enzyme that has lost the ability to hydrolyse oligosaccharide products, but can catalyze the coupling of a modified glycosyl donor molecules to acceptors. The enzymes that have been specifically exemplified in the specification as filed and in the post filing references include, for example, a β-glycosidase, a β-glucosidase, a glucanase, ... These particular examples provide evidence that glycosidases having different structures,

functions and substrate specificities can be mutated by the present invention to obtain the expected result' (Remarks, paragraph bridging pages 7-8). This is not persuasive because while the specification recites some enzymes, it does not teach which glycosyl donor and acceptor to use with any of these enzymes for coupling. Applicant's arguments can be taken as the suggestion that any of these enzymes modified at one of the two catalytically active amino acids having carboxylic side chain can be used for coupling of any donor and any acceptor, i.e. become enzymes with the same function. This does not seem feasible. The specification does not provide any examples to support the loss of any specificity for a mutant enzyme. For example, the specification does not provide any guidance as to what are other enzymes that can substitute the mutant of the instant invention, AbgE358A, in coupling of α-glucosyl fluoride or α-galactosyl fluoride as a donor and arylglycosides as acceptors to form oligosaccharides (see Tables 1-3). Neither specification nor the art allow to predict that a mutant of an endocellulase, for example, can be used to catalyze such coupling reaction. Applicants further argue referring to the specification on page 12, lines 3-11 that other glycosyl donor molecules are taught (Remarks, page 8). This is not persuasive because the claims are not limited to said "modified" glycosyl donors but to any modified glycosyl donor wherein "modified" is not defined. Applicants further discuss the experiments described in the Declaration by Dr. Withers. These arguments are not persuasive for the reasons discussed above in "***Response to Amendment***".

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elizabeth Slobodyansky, PhD whose telephone number is 571-272-0941. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10:00 - 6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ponnathapura Achutamurthy, PhD can be reached on 571-272-0928. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

E. Slobodyansky

Elizabeth Slobodyansky, PhD
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1652

February, 20, 2004